DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 715 CG 010 823

AUTHOR Kramer, Cheris
TITLE Female and Male Perception of Female and Male Speech.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, California, August 25-29, 1975); not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS High School Students; *Language Role; Questionnaires; *Sex Differences; *Social Attitudes; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Speech; Speeches; *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

The study elicited stereotypes of female and male speech behavior. The results give strong evidence that the speech of females and the speech of males, as perceived by women and by men, do not have the same subject matter, or the same manner of delivery. Of the 51 speech characteristics considered by the participants, 36 were rated as differentiating between female and male speech. These popular beliefs have an impact on people's behavior, especially in initial encounters. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128715

FEMALE AND MALE PERCEPTION OF FEMALE AND MALE SPEECH

Cheris Kramer
Department of Speech Communication
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cheris Kramer
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Presented at the session

"Sociolinguistics: Language and the Sexes"

Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association
San Francisco
25-29 August 1975

CG 010 823

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

Researchers in linguistics and speech communication are increasingly discussing the importance of considering language and society as necessarily interrelated. Interest in sociolinguistics has increased greatly in the past ten years, as evidenced by the appearance of new journals, courses, degrees offered, and textbooks. Labov writes:

> There is a growing realization that the basis of intersubjective knowledge in linguistics must be found in speech--language as it is used in everyday life by members of the social order, that vehicle of communication in which they argue with their wives, joke with their friends, and deceive their enemies. (1972, p. xiii)

Since this new discipline is concerned with the study of language in its social context and since sex roles are our most salient social roles, one would assume that sex-based variations would be an important field of study. But Labov's observation on the field helps indicate why the growing interest in sociolinguistics generally has not included an increased interest in the ways women and men in the United States use their language differently. As Labov unwittingly makes clear, as recently as 1972 the assumption within the new discipline has been that the primary subjects it focuses on--the "members of the social order"--are male: they have wives with whom they argue. However, the feminist movement in the 1960's and 1970's has changed the ease with which such assumptions can be made, not to mention the accuracy and validity of research grounded in the (unstated) principle that a finding applicable to men can be generalized to humans. The questionableness of research stemming from such assumptions and principles has served as a major impetus for the study of sex-based differences in speech behavior and attitudes toward speech behavior.

This present study deals with stereotypes, rather than (directly) with observed behavior. A brief review of literature dealing with stereotypes in

general and their relationship to behavior will serve as the base for the present study, which was designed to elicit stereotypes of female and male (everyday) speech behavior from white high school and college students. Related analyses not reported here compared those stereotypes against ratings made by the participants of their own speech and of "ideal" speech.

The Concept of Stereotype

Evidence of stable, widespread norms for the ways males and females behave differentially comes primarily from stereotype studies. In a review of literature dealing with ethnic stereotypes, Brigham (1971) faults most researchers for declaring that stereotypes are wrong in some way without indicating the criteria used in determining the unjustifiableness of participant responses. Even though often critical of the generalizations which study participants make, few researchers attempt to establish the validity or non-validity of the generalizations. If stereotypes are conceptualized as over-generalizations, as many researchers indicate explicitly or implicitly, then one would expect a validity criterion to have evolved. Yet there has been little effort based on empirical data to determine the validity of many of the traits dealt with in stereotype research. Other treatments of stereotypes describe them as attributions based on categorization (membership in the category implies possession of all the attributes of the category), as habits, and as rigid generalizations. Within this nexus of theoretical perspectives, the definition of stereotype adopted in this study is: beliefs and disbeliefs about a group of persons, as measured by the responses in the form of ratings to questions concerning the group of persons.

In addition to, and related to, the problem of determining what researchers mean by stereotypes is the problem of methodology. Asking participants to

pick out adjectives that are "typical" or "untypical" of each group may, Brigham reasons, force the participants into thinking in generalizations. Also, Brigham makes clear that procedures used in most stereotype research may, through requiring that participants use adjectives given by the researcher, force participants' responses into conceptual categories which are seldom used by them.

To avoid forcing participants into making generalizations in the present study, use was made of a series of scales, each ranging from 0 to 100, representing 0 to 100 percent: this type of scaling was suggested by Brigham. Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they believed certain speech characteristics are possessed by different classes of speakers. While many recent sex stereotype studies have used the authors' intuition in determining items used in testing situations (e.g., Ellis and Bentler, 1973), the present study, following the lead of Broverman et al. (1972), rejected both the use of personal intuition or traditional masculinity-femininity tests (which in any event would have few applicable items for a study of female and male perception of female and male speech) and used a new instrument consisting of perceived characteristics of speech behavior obtained through a free response listing of speech differences between men and women. (The participants who did this were from the same populations as those in the main investigation.)

An additional problem in work with stereotypes is determining their relationship to behavior. While it is generally assumed that stereotypes have relevance to behavior, the relationship has not been clearly demonstrated or even often probed. Brigham concludes that the relationship between stereotyped concepts and their use (or non-use) in behavior cannot now be ascertained until more research has been directed to this area. Stotland and Canon (1972)

also believe that it is not now possible to draw conclusions about what happens to stereotypes (Higher Order Schemas, in their terminology) as the holder of the stereotypes comes into contact with those persons stereotyped.

Yet despite these problems in conceptualizing stereotypes and their role in social behavior, there remains consistently high interest in stereotype research. Brigham writes:

> Despite this present state of affairs, which would appear to be rather bleak in terms of level of knowledge attained, most researchers seem to share the view that the concepts of stereotyping nevertheless can be of considerable value and importance in the understanding of human behavior. (p. 30)

Ehrlich (1973) assesses the value of stereotype research this way:

> To study stereotype assignments is to study the language of prejudice, for stereotypes provide a common language of discourse for prejudiced persons. As a special language, stereotypes function to reinforce the beliefs and disbeliefs of its users, and to furnish the basis for the development and maintenance of solidarity for the prejudiced. Stereotype assignments provide a vocabulary of motives for the action of prejudiced persons. They signal the socially approved and accessible targets for release of hostility and aggression. (p. 21)

Others have written of the value of work involving stereotypes and its application to sex-role research. In a summary of their research on sex-role stereotypes, Broverman et al. (1972) write that they believe that "existing sex-role standards exert real pressures upon individuals to behave in prescribed ways" (p. 60), and they have offered some empirical evidence in support of this claim.

The strength and longevity of sex stereotypes is noted by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) in explaining why it is that many popular beliefs about differences between the sexes have no basis in fact, or at least have not been found in empirical studies. Many carefully planned and executed studies do not find, for example, that girls are more "social" than boys although there is strong

popular belief that such a difference does exist. While acknowledging that it is possible that researchers just have not studied the particular situation or situations where this difference does exist, they conclude that they are dealing with a "myth" the persistence of which is explained by saying that "stereotypes are powerful things" (p. 335)--especially in social interactions between strangers. In summarizing across many studies dealing with parent-child relationships they state that parents, rather than treating children in terms of sex-role stereotypes, tend to deal with their children as individuals and are responsive to each child's particular temperament. They write, "Although this conclusion runs counter to common sense, it appears possible that relative strangers exert more stereotyping pressure on children than their own parents do." (p. 362). This suggests then that if the child is not known, individuals will rely on stereotypes in trying to anticipate the interests and behavior of the child. Similarly, Ehrlich's work on stereotypes has led him to believe that "if a social object is cast in a social category, then initial response will be determined more on the basis of its categorical characteristics than its individual characteristics" (p. 41).

Other work which lends support to the idea that stereotypes will have their primary impact during initial interaction is that done by Leik (1972). When Leik grouped strangers into simulated families, the men and women initially assumed traditional sex-stereotyped behavior: the men's behavior was "instrumental" and the women's "expressive." But Leik did not find this same rigid role differentiation in actual family interactions. Although more work is needed before conclusions can be reached, it seems likely that stereotypes are used to organize unfamiliar situations--such as encounters with strangers.

Speech Behavior and the Concept of Sex-Role Stereotypes

A person may be judged to possess certain qualities, for example independence, on the basis of her or his actions--changing jobs and locations, or not marrying, for example. But most people probably give more clues about their personality through their speech than through their other actions. Most of the stereotypic sex-role items in the Rosenkrantz et al. study are personality characteristics that can be revealed in speech. For example, traits such as aggressive, emotional, objective, dominant, excitable, logical, direct, self-confident, talks freely with men about sex, tactful, loud, talkative, use of harsh language, acts as leader--all could be studied within a focus on speech characteristics.

There is little literature directed specifically toward the study of stereotypes of sex-related speech differences. In a study of sex-linked cues in sentences that was conducted with first, third, and sixth graders and with adults (evidently older than college students), Edelsky (1974) found that for children above the first-grade level profanity was categorically (seventy percent or more of the responses) considered male while this was not true for adult responses, although adults, also, linked profanity more closely to male behavior than female behavior. Other sex-linked stereotypes of female and male speech have been found in studies in which college students were asked to determine on the basis of cartoon captions alone (students were not even told that they were rating cartoon captions) whether the words were delivered by a female or by a male, and then asked to give reasons for their choices. The first finding of these studies that is relevant here is that male and female respondents agreed on whether the speaker of the statement was male or

female. (Of the 133 comparisons only two achieved significance at the .05 level.) Attribution, then, did not vary by function of the sex of the participants. The male and female participants were using the same linguistic stereotypes in assigning the captions to male or female speakers. Also of interest here are students' reasons for their responses. A summary of their responses leads to the following composites. The speech of men is concerned with "important" aspects of our society; it is logical, literal, brief, concise, harsh, unfeeling, in control. The speech of women is concerned with "trivial" subjects, inappropriate to many locations, wordy, emotional, unorganized, out of control (Kramer, 1974a, and 1974b).

Some of the 41 sex-role traits reported in the Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) article were speech traits. A desirable speech trait attributed to males was "talks freely [with men] about sex," while desirable speech traits attributed to females were "doesn't use harsh language at all," "very talkative," and "easily expresses tender feelings." As mentioned before, many of the other traits listed are often expressed partly through speech. For example, also included in the forty-one items were "not at all emotional," "very dominant," "very direct," "easily able to separate feelings from ideas"--all considered positive masculine traits--and "very tactful," "very gentle," "very quiet"--all considered positive feminine traits. The complexity of the stereotypes is reflected in the seemingly contradictory responses of the male and female college students involved in the Rosenkrantz et al. study who rated females as "very talkative" and "very quiet." The same conflict is reported by Steinmann and Fox, (1974) who in their extensive research with male and female adults found that "males wanted a woman to express her ideas strongly, but,

somewhat illogically, they preferred a listener rather than a talker, just as the women predicted they would" (p. 101).

State of Research Questions

Within this paper three of the questions addressed in the study are treated. (The data gathered provides material for other questions which cannot be addressed within the limitations prescribed for this convention but which are dealt with in my dissertation, University of Illinois.) The three questions are:

1. Are Speech Characteristics of Male and Female Speakers Differentially Stereotyped?
2. Are Men's Assessments of Male and Female Speech Different, and Are Women's Assessments of Male and Female Speech Different?
3. Do Men or Women Perceive Greater Difference in Speech Characteristics between the Sexes?

Procedures

Study Participants Participants in the main investigation were 466 white students, from two high schools (116 sophomores, 128 juniors, 102 seniors) and from a university freshman class (100). An equal number of males and females from each class participated. Approximately half of the questionnaires were administered by a female researcher and half by a male.

Development of the Measuring Instrument The questionnaire was constructed from the responses of 10 females and 10 males from each of the seven population groups who were asked to list, in free-response, differing speech characteristics of female and male (everyday) speech. The male and female headings were at the top of the sheet they were given, but there were not directions indicating whether students should list linked traits (such as "tactful speech" - "blunt speech"). Only a few students consistently listed linked traits.

The purpose of asking students to list female and male speech characteristics was to obtain a list of traits deemed relevant by the population involved in the study. Items, both linguistic and paralinguistic, that occurred in the lists four or more times were included in the final questionnaire, except items referring to topics of speech (e.g., "hair"; "girlfriends"; "sports"). When traits were listed four or more times both in positive and negative phrases (e.g., "bad grammar" and "good grammar"), the trait listed the more times was selected for the questionnaire. Fifty-one items were obtained by this selection procedure. These 51 traits employed in the main investigation are listed in Table 1 in the order of their presentation to the study participants.

The questionnaire differed in important ways from instruments used in many previous sex-role surveys. The respondents were neither asked to determine which speech characteristics are descriptive of men and which of women, to make bipolar adjectives from the collection of traits, nor to reflect greatly before rating the "typical" behavior of females and males.

Following a procedure similar to that recommended by Brigham (1971) and used by Treasmer and Pleck (1974), an 11-point scale ranging from 0 to 100 (representing 0 to 100 percent) was used. That is, each scale was presented in the following form:

Concern for listener

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

For each item under each category of speakers, students were asked to rate the degree to which they believed the items are possessed by members of those categories.

Data Collection Procedures Each participant completed seven sets of ratings, four of which were germane to the investigation and three of which were included for purposes of distraction. A cover page explaining how to complete the scales preceded the seven sets of ratings.

The four sets of scales, each with the same 51 items, which were analyzed were listed under the following category headings: (1) male speaker, (2) female speaker, (3) self, and (4) ideal speaker. The female speaker scales were placed first in half of the questionnaires and the male speaker scales were placed first in the other half. The self scales and the ideal speaker scales followed in invariant order. These scales were separated by scales labelled (1) politician, (2) grade school teacher, and (3) police officer. Approximately half of the male and the female participants in each class received the questionnaire which began with the male speaker scales while the other half received the questionnaire which began with the female speaker.

Statistical Analysis The data were analyzed in a 2 x 4 x 4 analysis of variance design with repeated measures on the last factor. The two between group factors were sex of the participant (male vs. female) and school class (high school sophomore, junior, senior; and college freshman). Responses of participants at the same grade level were pooled after it was determined that there were no systematic effects as a function of school attended. The repeated measures factor was class of the speaker (male, female, self, ideal).

In order to test the specific hypotheses of the study, specific mean comparisons were made using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test (Kirk, 1969). Unless otherwise noted, all differences reported are significant at .05 level or below.

Results

1. Are Speech Characteristics of Male and Female Speakers Differentially Stereotyped? The most basic question addressed in this study, of course, was simply whether male speech and female speech characteristics are stereotypically perceived as different by high school and college students in our culture. Comparisons of the mean ratings for male and female speakers were made. The results of this comparison, along with the means for male and female speakers, are reported in Table 1. As that Table shows, 36 of the comparisons were significant. Table 2 presents a summary of characteristics rated by participants as differentiating between male and female speakers. These results, taken as a whole, strongly demonstrate that male and female speech characteristics are differentially stereotyped by both men and women in our culture.

2. Are Men's Assessments of Male and Female Speech Different, and Are Women's Assessments of Male and Female Speech Different? The results in reference to question #1 clearly show that speech is stereotypically perceived as a function of the sex of the speaker at least when the sex of the perceiver is disregarded. An important subsidiary question, however, is whether men and women differ in this stereotypic assessment process. The comparison of men and women participants' ratings of male and female speakers was once again made with Tukey's HSD test. The results show that men and women differed in their stereotypic assignment of speech characteristics to male and female speakers in 13 cases; men thought male speakers more straight to the point, more likely to lounge while talking, and more likely to have a sense of humor in their speech, while holding that the following characteristics are more descriptive of female speech than of male speech: enunciate clearly, trivial topics, friendly speech, good grammar, jibberish. Only women thought the

following characteristics more descriptive of female speakers than of male speakers: use hands and face to express ideas, concern for listener, wide range of pitch and rate, use many details, enthusiastic speech. In sum, the results demonstrate that while men and women generally agree in their stereotypic assignment of speech characteristics on the basis of sex-role, they differ in this assignment process for one-third of the stereotyped characteristics.

3. Do Men or Women Perceive Greater Difference in Speech Characteristics between the Sexes? For each characteristic the range between the ratings given to male and to female speakers by, first, men, and, then, women was determined. A count was made of the number of times men perceived greater differences (10) and the number of times women perceived greater differences (41). A value of chi square was calculated. With df=1, the resulting chi square of 18.84 is significant at $p < .001$. The results of this test show that women on the average perceived greater difference between the sexes for four times as many speech characteristics than did the men.

Discussion

This study establishes the existence of stereotypes of male and female speech held by white women and men in three populations--students in two high schools and a university. The participating high school and college students believed that the speech of males differs from the speech of females. There is good reason to believe that the results reported here can, in broad terms, be generalized to white American society. Support for this belief comes from the work of Ehrlich (1973) and Broverman et al. (1972), which shows that stereotype assignments are generally held across population groups differing in sex, age, religion, marital status, and schooling.

Participants listed the following traits as being more representative of male speech than of female speech: demanding voice, deep voice, boastful, use swear words, dominating speech, loud speech, show anger rather than concealing it, straight to the point, militant speech, use slang, authoritarian speech, forceful speech, lounge and lean back while talking, aggressive speech, blunt speech, sense of humor in speech.

Participants listed the following traits as being more representative of female speech than of male speech: enunciate clearly, high pitch, use hands and face to express ideas, gossip, concern for listener, gentle speech, fast speech, talk about trivial topics, wide range in rate and pitch, friendly speech, talk a lot, emotional speech, use many details, smooth speech, open and self-revealing speech, enthusiastic speech, smile a lot when talking, good grammar, polite speech, jibberish.

These stereotyped characteristics mentioned above do not, of course, necessarily correspond to actual differences in the speech of females and males, that is, differences which might be found through the study of the actual speech behavior of men and women. But as indicated above, the stereotypes, the beliefs held by the participants about the speech of women and men, have an importance of their own. The stereotypes are part of our social heritage. Ehrlich writes (1973) that stereotypes are "transmitted across generations as a component of the accumulated knowledge" and thus are "true" in some sense (p. 35). The stereotypes of male and female speech play a large part in determining how the speech behavior of women and men is represented in the mass media, and this representation in turn strengthens the pervasiveness and stability of the stereotypes. Evidence is accumulating that popular beliefs

about differences between the sexes have an impact on the behavior of women and men during initial interaction, as participants use stereotypes to help organize unfamiliar situations. Many encounters, of course, never go beyond the "initial" stage. Encounters between sales clerk and customer, and between employer and the person seeking employment are often, certainly in urban areas, one-time meetings.

In a capitalistic society where emphasis is placed on competition, it seems clear that male speech as described above is going to be considered more desirable economically. Block (1973)--in comparing the ideal behavior listed by American men with ideal behavior listed by men in countries such as Denmark and Sweden with long-time commitments to social welfare--found that Americans place significantly greater importance on the following traits: adventurous, self-confident, assertive, restless, ambitious, self-centered, shrewd, and competitive. American women's ratings were similar; they also emphasized the desirability of self-assertion (p. 520).

Female speech, then, is not only perceived as different from men's speech, but it is perceived as a sort of "counter language" to men's. It is considered to be open, self-revealing, gentle, polite, enthusiastic. These are positive traits. But when they are combined with the other perceived traits of female speech, that speech as an entire mode of delivery appears ineffectual. Both women and men perceive it as containing more gossip than men's speech. Men perceive female speech as containing more jibberish, more trivial topics than male speech. Especially in the perception of the men, female speech can be summarized as friendly, gentle, enthusiastic, grammatically correct, but containing jibberish on trivial topics. Kind, correct--but unimportant. The

control females are perceived to have is not over the speech situation but over the grammatical forms they use. The control males are perceived to have is not over such things as word choice or pronunciation, but over the speech situation. Women who would attempt to control speech situations are thus likely to be perceived as unwoman-like. Lakoff (1973) points out the problems this can bring as she writes that a female is "damned if she does" talk like a lady--and is thus seen as ineffective--and she is "damned if she doesn't"--and is thus seen as violating societal norms.

It would not be surprising, then, if women were more concerned with male/female differences in speech. In this study women gave the more extreme mean ratings, on 41 of the 51 characteristics as opposed to only 10 more extreme mean ratings given by the men participants. Labov (1972) reports that women are more sensitive than men to speech behavior (pp. 243, 309). This aspect of the present study seems to provide additional evidence for his work. Trudgill (1972), in reporting that women in Norwich, England, use speech forms associated with the prestige standard more frequently than do men, suggests that the subordinate position of women--who, he believes, are rated more by how they sound and appear rather than by what they do--makes it more necessary for women to secure their social status linguistically. If women do show more interest in this aspect of human behavior, they would likely be more sensitive to, and more likely to form impressions about, the ways male and female speech differs.

Implications of Findings

Important avenues of study are suggested by the basic finding of this study that speech behavior of males and females was perceived to differ on at least 36 characteristics. Each of these characteristics can be used, individually

or in various combinations, as beginning points or as interim check points for empirical studies of the ways that the speech of males and females may differ in actual speaking contexts. This study demonstrates, quite convincingly, that women and men in the populations tested possess stereotyped concepts of the speech of their own sex and of the opposite sex. This centralness of sex in our attitudes toward speech is not surprising in itself, and general assumptions of its existence have been at the core of previous discussions of sex-ralted differences in speech. But the present study establishes the range of characteristics that define the sexual stereotypes for participants from several populations.

Major generalizations about the existence of actual sex-based speech differences--as measured for example by syntax analysis, by word-frequency counts, and by measures of pitch variations--and generalizations about the existence of perceived differences will come not from one all-inclusive study but from a variety of studies asking different questions and using different methods. This area of study has only recently attracted many researchers, who have advanced many questions and many hypotheses about sex-based speech differences. The present study establishes the validity of asking in the first place questions about sex-based expectations about speech, and, by identifying a number of beliefs held by women and men about qualities of the speech behavior of men and women, provides a basis for further studies of perceived and actual differences,

References

This report is based on a doctoral dissertation completed under the direction of Jesse Delia, University of Illinois.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Brigham, J. C. Ethnic stereotypes. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 15-38.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 59-78.

Edelsky, C. Acquisition of an aspect of communicative competence: Learning what it means to talk like a lady. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City, November 1974.

Ehrlich, H. The social psychology of prejudice. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Ellis, L. J., & Bentler, P. M. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.

Kirk, R. E. Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, Calif: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969.

Kramer, C. Stereotypes of women's speech: The word from cartoons. Journal of Popular Culture, 1974, 8, 622-638. (a)

Kramer, C. Women's speech: Separate but unequal? Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1974, 60, 14-24. (b)

Lakoff, R. Language and woman's place. Language in society, 1973, 2, 45-80.

Labov, W. Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Leik, R. K. Instrumentality and emotionality in family interaction, in I. L. Reiss (Ed.), Readings on the family system. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, University Press, 1974.

Rosenkrantz, P., Bee, H., Vogel, S., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Steinmann, A., & Fox, D. J. The male dilemma. New York: Jason Aronson, 1974.

Stotland, E., & Canon, L. Social psychology: A cognitive approach. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1972.

Tresemer, D., & Pleck, J. Sex-role boundaries and resistance to sex-role change. Women's Studies, 1974, 2(1), 61-78.

TABLE 1

RATINGS OF MALE AND FEMALE SPEAKERS ON FIFTY-ONE CHARACTERISTICS BY SUBJECTS IN ALL CONDITIONS

Characteristic	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Difference
Demanding voice	65.5	41.0	24.5*
Enunciate clearly	58.8	65.5	6.7*
Deep voice	73.4	22.6	50.8*
Boastful speech	61.6	42.9	18.7*
High pitch	21.6	64.0	42.4*
Use swear words	76.1	49.3	26.8*
Use hands and face to express ideas	59.2	69.8	10.6*
Dominating speech	64.5	48.1	16.4*
Gossip	43.2	77.5	34.3*
Loud speech	68.8	48.8	20.0*
Relaxed speech	55.6	57.7	2.1
Concern for listener	51.2	61.5	10.3*
Interesting speech	58.4	59.0	.6
Gentle speech	38.9	62.0	23.1*
Fast speech	49.7	56.9	7.2*
Persuasive manner while speaking	58.4	59.7	1.3
Show anger rather than concealing it	67.7	54.7	13.0*
Talk about trivial topics	49.8	59.9	10.1*
Wide range in rate and pitch	46.9	55.8	8.9*
Look at listener directly when talking	58.7	63.8	5.1
Straight to the point	57.8	47.2	10.6*
Friendly speech	61.8	70.3	8.5*
Talk a lot	56.7	76.0	19.3*
Large vocabulary	57.4	61.2	3.8
Assume listener knows what speaker is talking about	64.1	62.9	1.2
Militant speech	48.6	34.8	13.8*
Use slang	75.3	59.2	16.1*
Emotional speech	45.7	70.0	24.3*
Authoritarian speech	61.4	49.0	12.4*
Use many details	51.7	64.8	13.1*
Serious speech	58.9	61.5	2.6
Forceful speech	64.0	45.7	18.3*
Lounge, lean back while talking	60.1	44.5	15.6*
Smooth speech	53.2	59.4	6.2*
Open-self-revealing speech	46.0	53.3	7.3*
Enthusiastic speech	57.6	64.2	6.6*
Explain things thoroughly	52.7	56.8	4.1
Smile a lot when talking	48.4	69.6	21.2*
Stutter	25.9	21.4	4.5
Patient speech	45.9	52.1	6.2
Good grammar	53.2	65.1	11.9*
Logical speech	60.4	57.9	2.5
Polite speech	53.5	69.8	16.3*
Nervous speech	39.0	43.2	4.2
Opinionated speech	66.7	65.4	1.3
Casual speech	63.8	65.8	2.0
Aggressive speech	61.0	44.6	16.4*
Jibberish	31.4	41.1	9.7*
Confident speech	64.2	60.3	3.9
Blunt speech	57.3	42.7	14.6*
Sense of humor in speech	68.4	60.9	7.5*

*significant at $p < .05$

TABLE 2

CHARACTERISTICS DIFFERENTIATING MALE AND FEMALE SPEAKERS FOR BOTH MEN AND WOMEN

Traits Characteristic of Male Speakers	Traits Characteristic of Female Speakers
Demanding voice	Enunciate clearly
Deep voice	High pitch
Boastful speech	Use hands and face to express ideas
Use swear words	Gossip
Dominating speech	Concern for listener
Loud speech	Gentle speech
Show anger rather than concealing it	Fast speech
Straight to the point	Talk about trivial topics
Militant speech	Wide range in rate and pitch
Use slang	Friendly speech
Authoritarian speech	Talk a lot
Forceful speech	Emotional speech
Lounge, lean back while talking	Use many details
Aggressive speech	Smooth speech
Blunt speech	Open, self-revealing speech
Sense of humor in speech	Enthusiastic speech
	Smile a lot when talking
	Good grammar
	Polite speech
	Jibberish

Significant at $p < .05$